

## **REMARKS**

Claims 141, 145 – 148, 232, 234, 235, 240, 242 and 243 are presently under consideration, with claims 142 and 149 – 157 having been withdrawn, and the remaining claims having been canceled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein. Applicants note that due to a numbering error in the Amendment and Petition for Extension of Time filed November 23, 2005, new claim 250 was added that should have been numbered 248 as claim 247 was the last claim that had been previously presented during prosecution. Due to the amendment made to claim 141, claim 250 has been canceled.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 & § 103**

In the Office Action mailed August 17, 2005, claim 141 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Gsthohl et al (US. 5,727,307). Claims 145 – 148, 232, 234, 235, 240, 242 and 243 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Gsthohl et al. In the Advisory Action mailed January 13, 2006, the Examiner refused to enter new claim 250 presented in the Amendment and Petition for Extension of Time filed November 23, 2005, and in the summary sheet, indicated that the above claims stood rejected. As the Advisory Action did not include any discussion of the basis for rejecting these claims, applicants assume that the basis for rejecting these claims is the same as stated in the Office Action mailed August 17, 2005, and are responding accordingly.

Turning first to amended independent claim 141, it is directed to a method for forming a given size armature to increase the power of an electric motor using that

given size armature. It recites, *inter alia*, molding plastic to at least partially encase the magnet wires in the plastic to hold them in place without using coil stays. Applicants have amended claim 141 to rephrase the last limitation of claim 141 along the lines presented in new claim 250 added in the Amendment and Petition for Extension of Time filed November 23, 2005. This last limitation of amended claim 141 now reads: “winding the magnet wires in the slots includes winding them so that they also occupy portions of the slots that are occupied by coil stays in an armature where coil stays are used to hold the magnet wires in place in the slots and where the armature in which the coil stays are used has the same size as the given size armature.” In other words, when winding the magnet wires in the slots of the lamination stack of the given size armature, these magnet wires are wound in portions of the slots that are occupied by the coil stays in armatures that use coil stays. This allows more magnet wire, either more turns or larger gauge wire, to be wound in the slots than in an armature where coil stays are used.

Applicants submit that Gstohl fails to disclose or suggest the above limitation of amended claim 141. While Gstohl et al. discloses molding plastic around the magnet wires of the armature, it is silent about whether coil stays are used. More importantly, it makes no mention of winding the magnet wires in portions of the slots of the lamination stack that would otherwise be occupied by the coil stays. By winding the magnet wires in the portions of the slots that would otherwise be occupied by the coil stays, a larger volume of magnet wire can be wound in the slots. This allows the armature to be wound with the same number of turns of magnet wire but with larger diameter magnet wires. It also allows the armature to be wound with more turns of the same size

armature wire. Applicants submit that amended claim 141 is allowable over Gstohl et al.

Amended independent claim 232 is directed to method for making an electric motor with a given size armature to increase the power of the electric motor using that given size armature. Amended independent claim 240 is directed to a method for making a power tool having an electric motor with a given size armature to increase the power of the electric motor using that given size armature. Applicants have amended them to include limitations comparable to those discussed with regard to independent claim 141 and submit that they are allowable over Gstohl et al. for at least the reasons discussed with respect to independent claim 141.

Claims 145 – 148 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 141, and are allowable for at least that reason. Claims 234 and 235 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 232, and are allowable for at least that reason. Claims 242 and 243 depend from amended independent claim 240, and are allowable for at least that reason.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 10, 2006

By: Roland A. Fuller III  
Roland A. Fuller III  
Reg. No. 31,160

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

RAF/akb